

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections. Claims 1, 3, 6-10, 16, 20, 22 and 23 have been amended. Claims 24, 27 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-16, 18-20, 22, 23 and 25 are pending.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claim 1, 16 and 22 for various alleged informalities. More particularly, the above objections propose punctuation changes to claims 1 and 22, and allege an improper verb conjugation in claim 16. Applicants traverse the above objections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants' claim amendments herein include the proposed punctuation change to claim 22, and render moot the proposed changes to claims 1 and 16. It is Applicants understanding that the claim amendments cure any alleged informalities. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection over *Hart*, alleged *APA*, *Prefs_1*, and *Prefs_2*

The Office Action rejects claims 1-16, 18-20, 22-25, 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of James Hart, "Early Adopter: J2SE 1.4", chapter 5, September 2001, Wrox Press, pp. 1-12 (hereinafter "*Hart*") in view of allegedly admitted prior art, (hereinafter "*alleged APA*") in further view of Sun Microsystems, J2SE: "Package Java.util.prefs" pp.1-2 (hereinafter "*Prefs_1*") in further view of "Class Preferences" pp. 1-24, Copyright 2003 - <<http://java.sun.com/j2se/1.4.2/docs/api/java/util/prefs/package-summary.html>> (hereinafter "*Prefs_2*"). Applicants refer to the *alleged APA* as such only for the purpose of brevity in addressing the claim rejection, and without acceding to the characterizations in the Office Action that any passage of the specification constitutes a prior art admission with respect to the claim limitations.

Claims 24, 27 and 28 are canceled herein, rendering moot the above rejection as applied thereto. For at least the following reasons, Applicants traverse the above rejection as applied to pending claims 1-16, 18-20, 22, 23 and 25.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of the above rejected claims is not obvious in light of *Hart*, *alleged APA*, *Prefs_1*, and *Prefs_2*, based at least on the failure of the references to teach or suggest (emphasis added):

"...the formatter to receive tracing messages from the tracing module and logging messages from the logging module, the formatter **including a configuration file** storing a default format definition for the formatter, the formatter initially to format messages from the tracing module and the logging module **according to the default format definition during a runtime of the formatter**, wherein the formatter **further to be reconfigured during the runtime to format messages from the tracing module and the logging module according to a changed format definition**, the reconfiguring the formatter including the configuration file receiving a change to the default format definition during the runtime, wherein the reconfiguring the formatter does not require recompiling of any source code of the integrated tracing and logging system;..."

as variously recited in current independent claims 1, 10, 16, 20 and 23. The claim amendments are supported in the original disclosure at least by paragraphs [00030] and [00078]-[00081] of the specification.

Hart discusses a Logging API which includes a formatter object. See, e.g. *Hart* pg. 2, 2nd paragraph. A LogManager class of the Logging API includes methods to manage certain elements of the LoggingAPI. See, e.g. *Hart* pg. 4, 1st paragraph. When a LogManager object is instantiated from the LogManager class, a "logging.preferences" file is read which dictates the precise configuration of the Logging API. See, e.g. *Hart* pg. 7, last paragraph. The Office Action (e.g. pg. 5, lines 8-17) interprets this reading of the "logging.preferences" file as allegedly relating to storing a format definition for the formatter.

However, this reading of a "logging.preferences" file by the LogManager object being instantiated occurs **upon first use** of almost any of the logging classes, and logging system settings are changed by accessing the LogManager class itself – **before performing any logging**. See, e.g. *Hart* pg. 7, last paragraph and pg. 9, second paragraph. In other words, *Hart* fails to disclose, for example, reading the "logging.preferences" file during some later operation of an already instantiated object

which has been configured by a LogManager object. Therefore, even assuming *arguendo* that reading the "logging.preferences" file in *Hart* to configure a Logging API stores a format definition in a formatter object, as the Office Action seems to suggest, *Hart* nevertheless fails to disclose, for example, **reconfiguring a formatter object** to format according to a changed format definition **during a runtime** of the formatter object.

Nor does *Prefs_1* or *Prefs_2* cure the failure of *Hart* to disclose a formatter reconfigured during a runtime of the formatter to format messages – e.g. from a tracing module and a logging module – according to a changed format definition. The Office Action seems to propose some modification to the reading of the "logging.preferences" file which incorporates use of the java.util.prefs.Preferences class discussed in *Prefs_1* and *Prefs_2*. As described in *Prefs_1* and *Prefs_2*, a Preference object collects preference data which, as particularly pointed out by the Office Action, can be propagated to a persistent backing store. Therefore, as Applicants understand the rejection, the Office Action is proposing using a Preferences object from *Prefs_1*, *Prefs_2* to collect the information which *Hart* normally reads from the "logging.preferences" file.

However, the way in which information might be collected for storing in the "logging.preferences" file (or some corollary persistent store) – e.g. collected with a Preferences object – does not cure the fact that in *Hart* it is only during instantiation of the LogManager object that such information is read to configure a Logging API. Even if such information were collected by a Preferences object from *Prefs_1*, *Prefs_2* for storage, the Logging API of *Hart* would still only read the stored information to configure the Logging API **upon first use** of almost any of the logging classes. Therefore, the combination of *Hart*, *Prefs_1* and *Prefs_1* relied upon in the claim rejection would fail to **reconfiguring a formatter during a runtime** of that formatter to format according to some changed format definition.

By contrast, current independent claims 1, 10, 16, 20 and 23 variously recite reconfiguring a formatter during a runtime of the formatter to format messages from a tracing module and a logging module according to a changed format definition. The *alleged APA* is not relied upon in the Office Action with relation to this variously recited claim feature. Therefore, the cited references fail to either teach or suggest at least one

limitation of the invention as variously recited in each of independent claims 1, 10, 16, 20 and 23.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 10, 16, 20 and 23 is non-obvious in light of *Hart*, the *alleged APA*, *Prefs_1* and *Prefs_2*, as are any claims depending therefrom. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request that the above 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of pending claims 1-16, 18-20, 22, 23 and 25 based on *Hart* be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the objections and rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-16, 18-20, 22, 23 and 25 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: June 16, 2009

/Dermot G. Miller/
Dermot G. Miller
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 58,309

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(503) 439-8778